

Remarks

Claims 1-46 are pending in the application. Claims 1-46 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 5, 13, 16, 28, 37 and 39 have been amended. The Applicants have added Claims 47-52. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of these grounds for rejection is requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 10, 12, 24, 26-30, 32, 33 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wenig (U.S. Pat. No. 6,286,298) and Sellers (U.S. Pat No. 5,311,438). The Applicants respectfully submit that neither Wenig nor Sellers are applicable, whether taken individually or collectively.

Wenig discloses “a system and method for capturing and recreating client requests and server responses, collectively referred to as a “hit,” for network sessions, particularly for transactions involving a Web site on the World Wide Web.” (emphasis added). Sellers discloses a system that utilizes a common database structure and common product definitions to communicate between various manufacturing systems. Thus, the Office Action concludes that Sellers discloses generating a summary report.

In Wenig, an “analyzer” utilizes a retrieved request/response session between a client terminal and a server, and any environmental data that may have been captured in association therewith, to create and redisplay the request/response session. The purpose of the analyzer is to “access a particular user session [hit] and visually recreate it.” Col. 5, lines 46-47. For example, the request/response session may be a dynamically generated screenshot such as a Web page with user input fields for implementing an online transaction. See Col. 7, lines 45-51.

However, as the Office Action correctly points out, Wenig does not suggest generating a report for association with a request/response session. In fact, the stated purpose of Wenig,

namely, the analysis of a particular user session as it occurred for the purposes of determining user Web browsing traffic patterns, requires replicating a particular user session rather than generating a summary report thereof. A summary report with abridged data would be of limited use for determining Web browsing traffic patterns. Therefore, Wenig is completely at odds with the creation of a summary report based on a user session and in fact, does not disclose, teach or suggest providing a summary report. It would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Wenig and Sellers as the Office Action suggests, because there is no such disclosure or suggestion to do so in either of Wenig or Sellers.

In reference to environmental data and the rejection of claims 1, 4-7, 9, 10, 12, 24, 26-30, 32, 33 and 35, Wenig appears to disclose “retriev[ing] associated environmental data that may have been stored with each request and response [hit]...” Col. 7, lines 42-43. The analyzer may further “analyze the environmental data,” Col. 7, line 54, and “generat[e] a screen based on retrieved request 134 and retrieved response 132 thereby recreating dynamically generated screen 120. In a step 530, analyzer displays the analyzed environmental data and the generated screen to analyst 210.” Col. 7, lines 56-60 (emphasis added).

Wenig does not teach or suggest making a record of the captured environmental data for separate use from a corresponding request/response session (e.g., by an administrator). Rather, Wenig discloses only the internal use of environmental data by, presumably, an automated process for recreating a request/response session. The captured environmental data is sent to “analysis tools (such as analyze [sic] module 620)...” Col. 8, lines 18-19. The resulting display version of the environmental data is thus an abridged, perhaps manipulated, version of the originally captured environmental data that is only displayed in conjunction with a corresponding request/response session. Further, this abridged environmental data is the only version of the environmental data that is disclosed as being displayed.

This is not what is claimed by the Applicants. The disclosure of environmental data captured solely for the purpose of internal analysis by an analyzer module teaches away from generating a summary report of the captured environmental data for presentation to a user. As such, generation of an environmental data record as allegedly disclosed in Sellers is not suggested by Wenig. Therefore, it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Wenig and Sellers as the Office Action suggests. The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 10, 12, 24, 26-30, 32, 33 and 35.

Claims 2, 3, 13-18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 36-41, 43, 44 and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wenig and Sellers in further view of Reuhl et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,873,069).

Reuhl discloses an enterprise-wide integrated computer system for storing, processing and reporting pricing information regarding a plurality of products in a plurality of stores in a plurality of markets. Reuhl also appears to disclose a pricing function for pricing and re-pricing products in response to market price changes. The Office Action states that Reuhl further discloses the restricting of access to information.

As stated above, it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Wenig and Sellers. Further, Reuhl's addition of restricting access to information further teaches away from the invention disclosed in Wenig. The objective of Wenig, as stated above, is to capture and recreate a request/response session to determine user Web browsing traffic patterns. However, if access to selected request/response sessions is restricted, an accurate determination of Web browsing traffic patterns will be difficult to achieve. Thus, in sharp contrast to Reuhl, Wenig requires unrestricted access to request/response session information. Therefore, it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to further combine Reuhl with Wenig and Sellers. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 2, 3, 13-18, 20, 21, 23, 29, 36-41, 43, 44 and 46 is respectfully requested.

Claims 8, 11, 31 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wenig and Sellers in further view of Barry et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,615,258).

Barry discloses an integrated data management system for providing data management services over the Internet. Barry further discloses an integrated customer interface and a Web-based delivery system for delivering to customers a number of products and services available from remote servers. The Office Action states that Barry further discloses the use of a hierarchical, expandable list.

As stated above, it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Wenig and Sellers. Further, Barry's addition of a hierarchical, expandable list teaches away from the invention in Wenig. Wenig only discloses using environmental information internally to recreate a request/response session. In some cases, Wenig discloses displaying an abridged version of environmental information in association with a corresponding request/response session. There is no suggestion in Wenig of cross-referencing the environmental information for a particular request/response session with other information or of utilizing environmental information independently from the redisplaying of a corresponding request/response session. In fact, Wenig does not disclose, teach or suggest any uses for a hierarchical, expandable list in relation to environmental data. Therefore, it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to further combine Barry with Wenig and Sellers. Withdrawal of the rejection based on Wenig, Sellers and Barry is respectfully requested.

Claims 19, 22, 42 and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wenig, Sellers, Reuhl and Barry. For the combination of the reasons set forth above in relation to the combination of Wenig and Sellers with Reuhl and the combination of Wenig and Sellers with Barry, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 19, 22, 42 and 45 are patentable. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Applicants respectfully submit that all of the prior art, whether taken individually or collectively, fails to teach or suggest the Applicants' claims as set forth above. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, which is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury
Reg. No. 31,750
Andrew A. Noble
Reg. No. 48,651
Attorney for Applicant(s)

TDC:AAN/pam
215-656-3381